A

LETTER

TO

JOHN BULL, Esq.

FROM HIS

Second Cousin *THOMAS BULL*.

Entered at Stationers-Hall.

A

LETTER

TO

JOHN BULL, Esq.

FROM HIS

Second Cousin *THOMAS BULL*,

AUTHOR OF THE

FIRST and SECOND LETTERS

TO HIS

BROTHER *JOHN*.

LONDON:

Printed by NORMAN and CARPENTER,
No 14, FETTER-LANE;

AND SOLD BY

F. and C. RIVINGTON, *St. Paul's Church-Yard.*

MDCCXCIII.

[Price One Shilling.]

A

LETTER

TO

JOHN BULL, Esq.

FROM HIS

Second Cousin THOMAS BULL,

AUTHOR OF THE

FIRST and SECOND LETTERS

TO HIS

BROTHER JOHN.

LONDON

Printed by NORMAN and CARPENTER,
Nº 14, PETTER-LANE;

AND SOLD BY

F. and C. RIVINGTON, St. Paul's Church-Yard.

MDCCXCIII.

[Price One Shilling.]

A

LETTER

TO

JOHN BULL, Eſq.

SIR,

YOU belong to an honourable branch of our family; but you have never deſpiſed your poor relations. I am therefore well aſſured, that this addreſs, which comes from one of them, will meet with a kind reception. To *Brother John* I can ſay what I pleaſe, and treat him with a jeſt or two, when he wants it, becauſe he and I are upon eaſy terms: but when I ſpeak to You, Sir, I muſt obſerve the formalities due to a perſon of a ſuperior ſtation.

Thomas Bull is a plain *farmerly* man, given up to the buſineſs of his calling, and finding in it that contentment, which you great gentlemen do not always find in the higher ways of life. It muſt be ſome preſſing occaſion which draws him out of his obſcurity, to embroil himſelf with adverſaries of more words than he has to ſpare: he knows with how much trouble and hazard to himſelf, every man that undertakes it, muſt encounter publick error; and that they, who cannot anſwer, will never ceaſe to rail. But he is ſupported under theſe diſcouragements by ſome ſhort and plain conſiderations. He is told of human life, that the way of it is a pilgrimage; and that the time of it is ſhort. He muſt therefore paſs through the world as he would ride through a town; where, if the people are rude, and the boys ſhout, and the dogs bark, a little patience and a quiet horſe will ſoon convey him to the ſilence and ſafety of a private road. It was alſo inculcated very early into his mind, that no danger is to be avoided when the good of our country is at ſtake, and that it is far more eligible to periſh *for* it than *with* it. If life itſelf is due

due to our country, every wiſe and honeſt man will readily offer to it his care and his reputation. He ſaw with how much induſtry that wicked libel of *Thomas Paine* was diſperſed, and even conveyed by ſtealth (like a rotten egg) into people's pockets, to poiſon the minds of the common ſort, and prepare them for ſome deadly miſchief; how it was poſted up, to be ſold, even along with old ſhoes, and butcher's meat. He heard how the approach of equal liberty and equal property, the univerſal downfall of Royalty and Religion, were trumpeted about by perſons affected to the anarchy of *France*; he had alſo received private intimations of a confederacy of a very dangerous deſcription: and though not with ſuch evidence as was clear enough to bring it forward, yet ſufficient to alarm a private perſon, and convince him that ſome great evil was intended: that no time was to be loſt, and that no language could be too ſtrong to ſecure the people againſt the prevailing deluſion of *French* Politics. Common underſtandings having been deceived, were to be addreſſed in a common way, and argued with from the plain principles of common ſenſe and reli-

gious duty, ſuch as they imbibed when they learned their Catechiſm; and ſuch as *Thomas Bull*, having always been uſed to them, could handle better than any other. The man in lower life, who writes by the light of a farthing candle, cannot be expected to ſee ſo far into ſome things as gentlemen do who burn wax. His firſt addreſs however, with all it's faults, was received with unexpected approbation, and had certainly a great and ſudden effect in opening the eyes and pacifying the minds of the common people.* But as one man's good is another man's evil (which, by the way, renders *equal liberty* an impoſſibility in nature), great diſapprobation was alſo to be apprehended. If there was a deſign to introduce a French Government, and that deſign was in any for-

* It is ſuppoſed, that, in the Engliſh and Welſh Languages, two hundred thouſand copies were diſperſed; and that by a *multitude of Editors*; amongſt whom there was one *Diſſenter*, if not more, who printed it without correcting or curtailing it, as ſome other perſons did; who would probably have done more good to the Publick, and acquired more honour to themſelves, if they had ſtood their ground. Other Gentlemen, of the ſame good intention with themſelves, did ſo; and found themſelves able to maintain it.

wardneſs,

wardneſs, and *Thomas Bull* happened to come acroſs with his Letter juſt at the critical time to intercept it; gentlemen who were well inclined to ſuch a Government would be a little ruffled and diſcompoſed. The defeat ariſing from that, and other co-operating cauſes, would add to their former *malignity* the rage of *diſappointment*.

It was eaſy to foreſee, that for the uſe of any *religious* argument, it might be objected to *Thomas Bull*, that he revives the Doctrines concerning Government, which (as ſome would have it) were given up at the Revolution in 1688. But Mr. *Burke* hath very ably and very ſeaſonably taught us, that the Revolution of that time did not alter the hereditary government of this Kingdom, but left laws and doctrines as ſacred as they were before. The Revolution in *France* hath aboliſhed them all: it is treaſon there to cry *God ſave the King:* If it were ſo here, our *Theatres* would be as guilty as our *Churches*. We are ſtill a *Chriſtian Nation*, and may talk and reaſon, may ſay or *ſing*, as if we were ſo; till the time ſhall come, which heaven avert, when we ſhall be allowed neither

neither to ſpeak nor to write, but at the will of ſuch Deſpots as have taken away the liberty of the Preſs in France. When a Government is to be overturned, the licentious uſe of the Preſs is demanded; but when it *is* overturned, the Preſs is ſtrictly guarded, and Printers are hanged up, leſt it be overturned *again*; and then we ſee at laſt what patriots meant by the *Liberty of the Preſs*. If we aſſert any alliance between the Powers of Earth and the Powers of Heaven, we muſt expect to be accuſed of ſetting up an *indefeaſible divine right*; a ſort of right not to be found in the Bible, but by thoſe who can ſee farther than *Thomas Bull*. He is indeed very plainly taught, that the *Moſt High ruleth in the kingdom of men*; but he knows better than to expect that any Stateſman, as ſuch, will ſecond him in the application; becauſe this is an article of Doctrine, not a rule of Government. Every good Government ſuppoſes it; but no government immediately acts upon it; till it maintains, with the fanatics of the laſt century, that *grace* and *dominion* go together. How much worſe than theſe are the fanatics of the preſent time; who do not act

under

under God by *miſtake*, but *againſt* God by *profeſſion!*

It was alſo apprehended, that ſuch of our *Diſſenters*, as had been notoriouſly active in ſpreading the doctrines of *Thomas Paine*; and who keep up an *Intereſt* againſt the Church, not for *conſcientious Scruples*, but for *political purpoſes*, would be ſtung when they were reminded of any Share they might have in the *troubles* of *America*, out of which proceeded the troubles of *France:* and exclaim againſt the ſuggeſtion as a *libel* upon the whole body. But ſuch an interpretation is reckoned very uncandid in all other caſes of the kind; and has not been inſiſted upon by thoſe among them, who, if the reflection were general, would have reaſon to be offended. When it is ſaid, that the outrages at *Birmingham* were committed by *the Churchmen*, it would be very unjuſt to apply this to the whole body of the Church of England; the peaceable and pious members of which diſclaim and abhor ſuch violent and illegal proceedings. If Dr. *Prieſtley* had offended againſt the Laws and the Peace of his Country, he ſhould have been

puniſhed

puniſhed by the Law. That his Adverſaries ſhould act in ſuch a manner as to expoſe *themſelves* to puniſhment inſtead of *him*, was probably the very thing he wiſhed for; that with ſome ſhew of reaſon, he who had ſo indiſcreetly acted for his *own* party, might caſt the blame of it upon other people. It would be a long queſtion, if we were to go into the origin and cauſes of the troubles in *America*, moſt of which, however, are pretty well known: and I hear of a very reſpectable Gentleman, who has by him in manuſcript a ſeries of ſmall pieces, compoſed at the *time*, and upon the *ſpot*, in which they are faithfully noted and laid open. As nothing of the kind has yet appeared, it is pity theſe pieces have been ſo long kept from the eye of the Public. That ſome of the Diſſenters had a large ſhare in thoſe Troubles cannot be denied; becauſe they have claimed the *honour* of it: and ſurely it would be inconſiſtent, if not ridiculous, to repel as *an accuſation* what has been publickly boaſted of as *a merit*. The Words of Dr. *Prieſtley*, in his diſcourſe at the funeral of Dr. *Price*, are very remarkable, and deciſive upon the caſe. " So ardent was his zeal for the *natural*

" *rights*

" *rights of men*, and ſo forcibly and effectu-
" ally did he plead the cauſe of liberty, civil
" and religious, that no inconſiderable pro-
" portion of the human race acknowledge
" his writings to have been of eminent uſe
" to their attainment of thoſe great *bleſſings:*
" and the moſt auguſt aſſembly in the world,
" by which I wiſh to be underſtood the
" *national aſſembly of France*, have juſtly
" ſtyled him the *Apoſtle of liberty*." p. 8.
To his *apoſtolical labours* the bleſſings in *America* are here imputed by Dr. *Prieſtley*. But then it happened unfortunately, that *their bleſſings* were *our troubles:* and when he imputes bleſſings, and we impute troubles, to the ſame cauſe, we are agreed as to the fact, and only view the ſame ſubject on a different ſide. Thus it is in reſpect to the affairs of France: what to us is *rebellion* to them is the *ſovereignty of the people*; and what to us is an attempt to reſtore the conſtitution, to them is rebellion; the only ſort of rebellion now remaining in the world: where we ſee maſſacre, they ſee deliverance; what we call anarchy, they call government; and what is miſery in our eyes, is enjoyment in their's. But then this is not true of

all the people of *France*; thouſands of whom ſit by in ſilent captivity, weeping over the ruins of their country. So when we ſpeak of *the Diſſenters*, the worth of individuals is always to be excepted; and *Thomas Bull* himſelf will be as ready as anybody to make the exception, where it is *due*. Nothing ſhould be marked for cenſure, but the reſtleſs *Spirit* of a *Faction*; which, wherever it is found, is always of pernicious effect; for *Parties* never bluſh; they are ſo ſupported by their numbers. A great ſin is broken into ſmall ſhares, ſo that they can commit enormities without remorſe, at which ſingle men would ſhudder. For the ſame reaſon, popular aſſemblies can do ſuch injuries, as no King, being a ſingle perſon, would chooſe or dare to do, for the ſake of his honour, and perhaps of his life. Many of the Diſſenters are as averſe as we are to the religious principles of Dr. *Prieſtley*, and the political principles of *Thomas Paine*; and though their flatterers may not wiſh it, their friends would have been glad, if they had ſignified the ſame by ſome public act half a year ago, that the wheat might have been ſeparated from the chaff. It is the misfortune

tune of every faction, that they who are *beſt* among them are led by the *worſt*; who, being commonly clever and active perſons, have the forming of their ſchemes, and ſee to the execution of them. But I ſay no more of this, becauſe I am informed that a Gentleman of great abilities and equal candour intends to expoſtulate with the Diſſenters as to ſeveral particulars of their late conduct.

And now, Sir, I beg leave to quit the conſideration of *my* affairs, that I may talk with you a little about your own, which are of more conſequence. From your anceſtors you have inherited a good eſtate, which you will be glad to keep and tranſmit to your poſterity: therefore you have good reaſon to be alarmed, when a *war* is declared againſt *property* on the ſuppoſed *natural rights of man*. Let us aſk then, *who* is *man?* Man, in the abſtract, is a being between the Deity and the brute creation; and his rights, in that capacity, can be only againſt God and againſt the beaſts. There is a third right, which is that of one man againſt another man; and when we treat of this, we may

ſpeak ſenſe. Inſtead then of ſaying *man*, in the general, let us ſay *ſome man*, and then we may get forward: but the logicians teach us, that they always dwell upon *generals*, who wiſh to deceive us about *particulars*. Thus *Engliſhmen*, for example, have their rights againſt *Frenchmen*; and one Engliſhman has a right againſt another Engliſhman; and every *poſſeſſor* in the world has a right to what he has got, till ſomebody elſe can *ſhew a better*. How is that to be done? Never but by ſome law, applicable to the caſe. All actual right is under ſome law; and, till there is law to diſtinguiſh, there is no right; nor any ſecurity of poſſeſſion, till there is an authority to execute the Law. Hence the Romans ſignified *Right* and *Law* by the ſame word, *Jus*. I take *Lex* to be the law as it is written, and *Jus* to be the law as it is adminiſtered; from whence comes the word *Juſtice*, which means the adminiſtration of law, or diſtribution of right and property. Hence, if there be no law, there is no juſtice: conſequently, a ſtate of nature, if there were ſuch a thing, muſt be a ſtate of violence, with no right but that of force, which is the right of the beaſts. It is

the

the right a dog has to a bone, which he has taken away from another dog, becauſe he was the ſtronger of the two. A right *above law* is the right of a *Deſpot*, who is a *Law to himſelf*, and becomes ſuch by the power of the ſword. A right *without law* is the right of a thief; and every man who aſſerts it is a thief in *theory*; worſe than a thief in practice: as an *evil ſpirit*, being an *author of ſin*, is worſe than an *evil man*, who is only a practitioner.

Natural Right is a principle, which cannot be brought to any effect, but upon a preſumption that the world is now *unoccupied*; or by *diveſting* the preſent poſſeſſors, and *laying all property open*, to be ſcrambled for. By thoſe who have any thing, this principle ſhould be guarded againſt in time: they only can profit by it, who have nothing, or deſerve nothing. Any change will be acceptable to thoſe who cannot change for the worſe.

National Right has of late made a great noiſe; but who can diſcover what it is? If it be a defenſive right in a *nation* againſt their *King*,

King, what will become of it when there is *no King?* If it be a defenſive right in one nation againſt another nation, it muſt go with the ſoil of which they are poſſeſſed; that is, it muſt be confined to the *natives*; and then how comes it to paſs, that any *national* rights of *France* can be found in *Thomas Paine* and Dr. *Prieſtley*, who are *Engliſhmen? Thetford* and *Birmingham* being within the borders of England, how can the natives of thoſe places have national rights in France? I grant they may be taken into a participation of ſuch rights *de facto*; but then the *Philoſophy* of national right is either given up, or comes to nothing.

When *Man* is taken in the abſtract, it is never inquired whether he has any *Religion*, or whether he has none; whether he is wiſe or fooliſh, white or black: he is taken without his qualities either of mind or body, and without his obligations to God or to man: and then there is nothing left of him but the *animal* called by the name of *man*; and his rights as ſuch are not the rights of a chriſtian, nor of a civilized, nor of a ſocial being, but of an animal only. I have there-

fore

fore frequently wondered, why they who aſſert *rights* to man in this capacity, do not allow the claim of right in *other animals:* and why they do not carry on their principle, where it muſt go in ſpite of them, from the rights of man to the rights of beaſts. For, ſo far as right is *natural*, beaſts muſt have it as well as man: and what will it prove? It will prove, in the *rat*, a right to gnaw our victuals and undermine our habitations: in the *fox*, a right to take the poultry: in the *wolf*, a right to eat the ſheep; for all creatures have a *right* to *live*, and it is the *nature* of theſe creatures to live in this manner. When Religion is brought into the queſtion, without which man and the world are both inexplicable, all the difficulty is anſwered in a moment. We produce our *Magna Charta* of Revelation, which ſhews us how God has given to man a ſovereignty over all the Creation; and that *wild beaſts are made to be taken and deſtroyed:* becauſe, as God will one day *caſt out of his kingdom all things that offend*, man has authority to do the ſame thing now in *his* kingdom. This we allow to be one of the rights of man; but not a *natural* right, becauſe it is a right held under a poſitive

ſitive law: and he who parts with that law deſerves to ſuffer the conſequences, and forfeit the prerogatives of a man: the beaſts of the field ought to prevail againſt him; the Horſe ſhould kick him; the Bull ſhould toſs him; the Swine ſhould gore him; the Serpent ſhould bite him.

If natural rights were extended to the beaſts, it is evident, the moſt evil of them would always have the advantage; and the innocent, being weaker, would be ſure to ſuffer. So if men were turned looſe to their natural liberty, it is equally certain the worſt men would have the moſt of it. This they themſelves know; and that makes them bawl ſo loud for it: but, to prevent what they wiſh, is the firſt deſign of Government; and power is given to Kings and Rulers for this purpoſe only. As things are now, no man can poſſibly injure another, without offending againſt ſome known law of God: and as God does not execute his own laws in perſon, others muſt be appointed to do it for him, and by his authority, not by their own: for then the ſovereignty would be not in God, but in them. This is *my* original of Government;

vernment; and I think men never did, nor ever will make ſenſe of any other Scheme. And if after this any Gentleman *of property* can ſpend his wit and his oratory in defending the principle of *natural right* againſt poſitive law, he is whetting the axe which is laid to his own root: and his underſtanding, whatever noiſe he may make with his tongue, is at laſt but of a ſize with that of the poor Iriſhman, who, ſitting on the bough of a tree, chopped on the wrong ſide of him, and let himſelf down to the ground.

As for the invention, of which the French Revolutioniſts are now ſo fond, that *all* power of government muſt ariſe by contribution from the people who are governed, and that *no* power is legal but what does ſo ariſe; theſe are very raſh aſſertions, not agreeable to the order of nature and the ſenſe of things. And beſides, we have a principle here, which, as it is now applied, inſtantly diſſolves the Britiſh Government. For, if *all legal* power muſt ariſe from *popular delegation* (which is now the *French* principle of Government) then the power, which doth *not* ſo ariſe, but deſcends by inheritance, is *illegal:* which

being the caſe here with the *Crown*, and the *Houſe of Lords*, they muſt fall of courſe as ſoon as this popular principle ſhall be brought to effect, in its full extent. Therefore let Engliſhmen be aware, that if what is called a *Reform of Parliament*, to which the friends of *Thomas Paine* are now tranſferring their hopes, ſhould come forward on the *French Principle*, it muſt amount to a diſſolution of the preſent Government, and the whole ſyſtem of our laws; and *magna charta* itſelf muſt go with them, as being a law derived to the people by conceſſion from the Crown: for though *magna charta* was forced from the King, yet they who forced it from him, did ſo, becauſe they knew it would not be legal without him. What I here ſay is not merely from the reaſon of the caſe, though that is plain enough; but is grounded on poſitive evidence. I have before my eye a piece by the Politician, who ſtyles himſelf the author of *A Call to the Jews*, and who in the year 1785 ſtruck out for *England*, under the fictitious name of *Utopia*, a plan of Parliamentary Reformation; and took the form of *thirty-nine Articles*, for an inſult on the Religious Doctrines of the Church of England;

England; applying to it, in a *Motto*, that text which Dr. *South* applied to Dr. *Burnet—forty ſtripes ſave one.* By theſe articles of reform, all perſons *promoted by a King or by a miniſter*, and all *grandees*, that is, all who are noble by birth or by creation, are excluded, with *convicts* and *madmen*, from having any ſhare in the *Legiſlative Delegation*. This curious publication let the *Fox* out of the bag very early: and the author of it has been remarkable for the ſimplicity and integrity of mind, with which he has always betrayed his own ſchemes and thoſe of his party.

I would requeſt you, Sir, farther to obſerve, how this new opinion, of there being *no legitimate power* but by *popular delegation*, totally excludes the Providence of God from having any ſhare in the Government of Nations: and indeed they who argue for it do generally ſpeak throughout, as if *God was not in all their thoughts*. They call the belief of Divine Providence by the cant name of *Superſtition*; a word which, in their mouths, includes all *true Religion*; and openly declare they *muſt deſtroy it, or it will deſtroy them.*

But does not every ſchoolboy know, how many Governments have ariſen in the world from the ſole principle of conqueſt, and laſted for ages? and is not this principle, though diſavowed for convenience, ſtill lurking behind the curtain in France; where the ſword in the hand of one party has erected a government upon the ruins of another party? All Europe can anſwer the queſtion. When authority and power were any where eſtabliſhed on the principle of conqueſt, he that gave the victory made the Government: and therefore he claims a prerogative of *putting down one, and ſetting up another*. He is therefore called the *Lord of hoſts*, that is of *armies*; and celebrated as a *man of war*; becauſe the armies of the world ever were under his direction, and ever will be; though *the heathen furiouſly rage together, and the people imagine a vain thing*; even that vaineſt of all vain things, an imagination, that they can dethrone God, and govern the world in his ſtead, by their *own laws* and their *own providence!* When the *Jews* were to be deſtroyed, and the *Romans* went againſt them for that purpoſe, the parable had foretold, that *the King (God)* ſhould

ſhould ſend forth *his* armies: and when the ſame nation was captive under the *Aſſyrians*, he commanded his people to ſubmit to them; to *pray for the life of Nabuchodonoſor* and of *Balthazar his Son:* even as our Saviour allowed the *Roman* power in *Judea* by *paying tribute* to it; and even working a miracle to enable himſelf ſo to do. This was a government by Conqueſt: and, by the laws of God ſuch Governments are valid, though the feelings of man do not find them agreeable in theory. Strike off the power of divine providence; and ſtrike off the laws of Religion; and then, and not till then, we may derive all Government by a delegation from the people: it is therefore nothing wonderful, that this principle and atheiſm ſhould go together, as they now do in *France*; and whether atheiſm begets *it*, or it begets atheiſm, is not worth a diſpute. Yet after all I have ſaid on delegated power, I deſire you, Sir, who are a moderate man, to obſerve, that I deny no more than the *univerſality* of the principle, as applied to Government. I hold it utterly untrue to affirm, that *all* power muſt ariſe by delegation: and as untrue to ſay, that *no* power doth ſo ariſe; becauſe

But does not every ſchoolboy know, how many Governments have ariſen in the world from the ſole principle of conqueſt, and laſted for ages? and is not this principle, though diſavowed for convenience, ſtill lurking behind the curtain in France; where the ſword in the hand of one party has erected a government upon the ruins of another party? All Europe can anſwer the queſtion. When authority and power were any where eſtabliſhed on the principle of conqueſt, he that gave the victory made the Government: and therefore he claims a prerogative of *putting down one, and ſetting up another*. He is therefore called the *Lord of hoſts*, that is of *armies*; and celebrated as a *man of war*; becauſe the armies of the world ever were under his direction, and ever will be; though *the heathen furiouſly rage together, and the people imagine a vain thing*; even that vaineſt of all vain things, an imagination, that they can dethrone God, and govern the world in his ſtead, by their *own laws* and their *own providence!* When the *Jews* were to be deſtroyed, and the *Romans* went againſt them for that purpoſe, the parable had foretold, that *the King (God)* ſhould

ſhould ſend forth *his* armies: and when the ſame nation was captive under the *Aſſyrians*, he commanded his people to ſubmit to them; to *pray for the life of Nabuchodonoſor* and of *Balthazar his Son:* even as our Saviour allowed the *Roman* power in *Judea* by *paying tribute* to it; and even working a miracle to enable himſelf ſo to do. This was a government by Conqueſt: and, by the laws of God ſuch Governments are valid, though the feelings of man do not find them agreeable in theory. Strike off the power of divine providence; and ſtrike off the laws of Religion; and then, and not till then, we may derive all Government by a delegation from the people: it is therefore nothing wonderful, that this principle and atheiſm ſhould go together, as they now do in *France*; and whether atheiſm begets *it*, or it begets atheiſm, is not worth a diſpute. Yet after all I have ſaid on delegated power, I deſire you, Sir, who are a moderate man, to obſerve, that I deny no more than the *univerſality* of the principle, as applied to Government. I hold it utterly untrue to affirm, that *all* power muſt ariſe by delegation: and as untrue to ſay, that *no* power doth ſo ariſe; becauſe

cauſe we ſee in fact a part of the power of our own Government undoubtedly ſo conſtituted. I would therefore here keep a *middle path*; to ſecure Government from *inſult* on one hand, and *preſumption* on the other.

Government is ſometimes rendered odious and frightful, becauſe it provides for the public defence by a ſtanding army. But the truth of the caſe is this: every Gentleman muſt either defend his property *himſelf*, or hire ſomebody elſe to do it for him. If good men will learn the uſe of arms, and be ready on occaſion to defend themſelves in perſon, which might be a good thing, and is already done in part by the eſtabliſhment of our *Militia*, there will be of conſequence leſs call for ſtanding forces. But after all, what is the evil of a ſtanding army, compared with that of a *Paris Mob?* I uſe myſelf to conſider this world as an *high-way*; and the caſe of every Government as parallel to that of a ſtage-coach upon the road. A military force is as neceſſary to a nation, as a guard is to defend the paſſengers from robbers. But then an army may be an Engine of

of Tyranny; ſo it may: but much worſe, when it is under demagogues who are *afraid of it*, and muſt keep it in good humour by *glutting it with plunder*, than when it is under a King, who has the command of it by Law. The guard behind may turn his blunderbuſs upon the paſſengers in the coach; and ſo may every proviſion for our ſecurity in this world be turned to our deſtruction. Our victuals may choak us: but ſurely they are fooliſh people, who expoſe themſelves to danger which is obvious and certain, through a ridiculous fear of that which is imaginary; and give up their purſe to a highwayman, becauſe the guard may miſuſe his weapons. Nothing demonſtrates to me ſo fully the fanatical abſurdity of the French Political Philoſophy, as the notion with which they firſt ſet out; *viz.* that we ſhould have no more war when we had no more kings. For, will there be no more highwaymen upon the road, when there is no longer a coachman upon the box? And was ever war carried about ſo wantonly, and executed ſo ſeverely, as by the French under their new Republic? And were the French Soldiery ever ſuch Inſtruments of Tyranny, as ſince they proved faithleſs

faithleſs to their King and their Laws? Take away the ſword from the King, and give it to the people; and what ſhall we get by it? We ſhall fall into the hands of a faction; about whom, all the rogues and beggars of the nation will aſſemble, and form a lawleſs power, more troubleſome and mercileſs than any ſingle tyrant upon earth.

Which is the beſt for ſociety, a *Monarchy* or a *Republic*, is a queſtion much agitated of late, and happy would it be, if it might be decided rather by the pen than by the ſword. On the republican ſide, there is the great learning of Mr. *Thomas Paine*, and the arms of the French nation: for the French, finding their tongues fail them in the argument, ſet the mouths of their cannons and mortars to diſpute for them. On the monarchical ſide, there is the experience of mankind; the general rule of Providence; and the arms of the greater part of Europe. To follow this great queſtion, Sir, in it's detail, is not my intention, neither would a ſhort piece, like this, admit of it. I ſhall therefore throw together a few facts and obſervations,

obſervations, out of which ſomething like an anſwer might be framed.

Hiſtory does not inform us, that any government of the popular form exiſted in the world, till the republics of *Greece* and *Rome* were generated of rebellion and regicide. *Egypt* was a great and flouriſhing kingdom, above a thouſand years before they were heard of. From the account of the *Trojan* war, we find that *Greece* was then divided into monarchical ſtates: and the writers, who give a hiſtory of the Roman and Grecian republics, are obliged to confeſs, that all the ſtates upon earth were originally under Kings *(Initio reges, * nam in terris nomen imperii id primum fuit.)* And what is more, they allow this to have been the *legitimate* form of Government *(imperium legitimum nomen imperii regium habebat)*, as being the only form agreeable to the laws of nature: for every *body* muſt have a *head*, and that head can properly be but *one:* and when the body of the Roman State took *two heads* inſtead of one, this form was introduced *(more*

* Salluſt—Bell. Cat.

 immutato)

immutato) as an innovation; and with it came in the new doctrine of the power of the populace, never before heard of: as the world had never before heard of a body with *two heads*, but under the character of *a monſter*. The State of the *Hebrews*, as ſoon as they emerged from Egyptian ſlavery, was a Monarchy under *Moſes*, who is called *King in Jeſhurun*. He was in alliance with the *Church*, the head of it being his brother; and he was aſſiſted by a *Council*, who joined with him in the government of the people: and in this we have the outlines of every good government which hath ſince been eſtabliſhed in the world. Mr. *Thomas Paine*, in his capacity of a political Divine, would make us believe, that Regal Government is contrary to the will of God, becauſe God is ſaid to have given the Hebrews *a King in his wrath*, when he gave them *Saul*. Under what circumſtances he did this, and in what ſenſe the thing was wrong, the Staymaker of *Thetford* was not qualified to diſtinguiſh. But if you look at the hiſtory, you will ſee, that when Saul was appointed, there was no change of the ſpecies of government, but only of the perſon. From their ſettlement

in

in Canaan, God was their King, as he tells them, and ſome prophet was his prime miniſter, who happened at that time to be the prophet *Samuel*. But they took a diſlike to this *religious* kind of *polity*, as they had before taken a diſtaſte to the *Manna* in the wilderneſs; and demanded a military Leader; a *Soldier-King*, ſuch as the heathen nations had who were round about them. With this God was offended, though he aſſented to their demand; becauſe, in requiring a mortal King, they had rejected *him:* and therefore he tells *Samuel*, his miniſter, *they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me from being King over them*. To make our caſe in England parallel to this; and to ſhew, from the caſe of the Hebrews, that we ought not to have George the third for our King, at leaſt that God will be *in wrath* with us if we take him, ſome monſtrous ſuppoſitions muſt be made: as, that George the ſecond was the Divinity of the people of England, and that the Duke of *Newcaſtle*, his miniſter, was a prophet: but this being totally inadmiſſible, it is prepoſterous to argue from one of theſe caſes to the other; and if God gave Mr. *Thomas Paine*, who has done this, to

be an Interpreter of the Scripture to the people of *England*, it muſt have been an act of his *wrath*.

The Roman Hiſtorians confeſs, that all that order and dignity of their ſtate, that plan of their city, thoſe arts and enſigns of war, which, with many other particulars, were the foundation of their future greatneſs, were wholly derived from the authority and wiſdom of their Kings; who are ſaid to have ſettled all things in ſo exact a form, that the Oeconomy of their ſtate was as well regulated as that of a private family by the Father or the Maſter of it. And ſo was the Oeconomy of this Kingdom, as it ſubſiſts even to this day, chiefly derived from the wiſdom and attention of one great *Alfred*; in whom, with a character of a King, we find the Patriot, the Scholar, the Hero, and the Saint.

After Rome became a Republic, it was ſo divided in it's authority, that it could not act with effect in caſes of any great and ſudden emergency; and therefore it retained a ſtated proviſion, that in all ſuch caſes it ſhould reſolve itſelf into a Monarchy under the

the abſolute power of a Dictator: and every reader of their hiſtory knows how often they were ſaved by the expedient of ſuſpending the authority of their *two* ſupreme magiſtrates, and returning to the order of nature, which to one body gives but one head. We are ſhocked when we ſee how they provided againſt the return of Royalty by every poſſible act of ingratitude and ſeverity: fathers cutting their children to pieces on ſuſpicion of Loyalty: the populace diſgracing their beſt friends, and even deſtroying the deliverers of their country, through a jealouſy of their turning themſelves into Kings. For as Royalty was reputed the greateſt of evils, ingratitude, perfidy, cruelty, and all other evils, transformed themſelves into virtues, if they were practiſed to exclude it.

Republics, ſome ſay, are to be preferred for their cheapneſs; none of that expence being required, which is neceſſary to keep up the ſtate of a King and his officers. But the obſervation is not agreeable to fact. The Kings of Rome lived upon their own territories; but the Republic aimed as much at univerſal *property* as univerſal *empire*; they drew

drew money from all nations; and their Proconſuls were every where kept with the ſtate and the expenſiveneſs of Monarchs, ſubſiſting on that property, to which they had no right but from their ambition and the power of the ſword. Our firſt Commonwealth in England, which was raiſed on the ruin of Charles the firſt and of the people, coſt the nation more money, and raiſed more taxes, than all their kings before, from William the Conqueror, put together: more in ten or twelve years than the Kings in five hundred. And if the French nation compute fairly their charges of the laſt year, they will find nothing like it in the annals of their *Kings.**

It

* It has been computed, that they have lately expended twelve millions ſterling in a month. To ſhew how the World impoſes upon itſelf in reſpect to the expenſiveneſs of Government, I beg leave to introduce the following obſervation on the expenſiveneſs and tyranny of the Republic of Holland, from Sir *William Temple*. " Thus this ſtomachful people, who could not endure " the leaſt exerciſe of arbitrary power or impoſitions, or " the ſight of any foreign troops under Spaniſh govern- " ment, have ſince been inured to all of them, in the " higheſt degree, under their own popular magiſtrates; " bridled with hard laws, terrified with ſevere executions,

" environed

It is farther objected to monarchies, that they are productive of wars, from the ambition of princes: but Republics have generally been much more productive of them; and the man muſt be as ignorant as a child who denies it. How often did the Roman Republic betake itſelf to the expedient of foreign war, as the only remedy againſt thoſe domeſtic feuds and diſturbances, which aroſe naturally in their Government, from the mock-equality of the whole, and the conjunct tyranny of the few? Did they not carry

" environed with foreign forces; and oppreſſed with the
" moſt cruel hardſhip and variety of taxes that was ever
" known under any government; but all this, whilſt the
" way to office and authority lies through thoſe qualities
" which acquire the general eſteem of the people; whilſt
" no man is exempted from the danger and current of
" laws; whilſt ſoldiers are confined to frontier garriſons
" (the guard of inland and trading towns being left to
" the burghers themſelves); and whilſt no great riches are
" ſeen to enter by public payments into private purſes,
" either to raiſe families, or to feed the prodigal expences
" of vain, extravagant, and luxurious men; but all pub-
" lic monies are applied to the ſafety, greatneſs, or honour
" of the ſtate, and the magiſtrates themſelves bear an
" equal ſhare in all the burdens they impoſe."

Obſervations on the United Provinces and their Government.

wars

wars all over the world, more than any nation had ever done before them: while the Monarchy of the Hebrews, when once ſettled, never extended itſelf beyond it's natural limits? It's powers were all employed for the benefit of it's own internal œconomy: all it's wars were defenſive. But did not Rome and Carthage, two Republics, fight to the laſt extremity, each ſuffering ſlaughter and devaſtation in it's turn, and ſweeping down great and opulent cities with their train, for nothing but ſuperiority; and nothing could pacify the one but the extirpation of the other. After this, I think we need not go to Kingdoms and Monarchies for the ſlaughterous effects of ambition and avarice.

The Romans, by their own account of themſelves, inherited a barbarous and ſavage ſpirit from the beginning. Their firſt King, ſaved, as they ſay, from a river in his infancy, like *Moſes*, was ſuckled by a wolf: and when his city was building, the rapacious temper of it's people was prognoſticated by a flight of *vultures*. Upon it's firſt walls *Romulus* ſlew his brother, conſecrating them by the ſhedding of human blood. It's firſt

ſtock

ſtock of inhabitants were begotten of raviſhed virgins. From ſuch an origin, what could be expected, but that Providence was about to ſhew, from the example of the Romans, what is the temper and quality of human ſociety, when it is generated, as their ſtate was, from the ferocious paſſions and appetites of human nature? For a time, they endured the government of their kings; and they would have been nothing without it: but at the end of two hundred years, the wild ſpirit of republicaniſm began to work, and they drove out their kings with enthuſiaſtic fury; transferring all the rights of royalty from the *head* to the *body*, and aſcribing *ſovereign majeſty* to the *people*. Whenſoever and whereſoever the ſame ſpirit ariſes, it will work in the ſame way, and uſe the ſame language to the end of the world.

At this time we are witneſſes to an event of the ſame kind; but with ſymptoms of ſuperior wickedneſs; becauſe that which was beſt will always become worſt when it is corrupted. And it is curious to obſerve how cloſely the French have followed the Romans in the degeneration of their ſtate:

ſometimes perhaps by a fatality on their proceedings; but generally from affectation and deſign, as pedants in rebellion: and their pedantry is ſuch, as to teach the world that their principles are of *heathen* original. When the king was expelled from Rome, the people ſeized his effects, deſtroyed his palace, and converted his land into their *campus martius*; ſo the French have now their *champ de mars* upon the ſpot lately occupied by the baſtile: but when they had emptied and razed one priſon of the king, in which (notwithſtanding the horrid idea the people had been taught to entertain of it, and which it had, in former times, certainly well deſerved) very few priſoners were found, they ſoon filled an hundred priſons of their own. The project of aſſaſſination was adopted at *Rome*, when *Porſena* interpoſed for the reſtoration of their kings, and three hundred aſſaſſins conſpired to make away with him: as the French declared an intention to convey death by ſome hand, and by ſome means, to every crowned head in Europe; and it was propoſed to embody and equip twelve hundred men for the ſole purpoſe of private aſſaſſination. When royalty fell

fell into diſgrace at Rome, the female ſex grew bold with the new fire of liberty, and have been celebrated by hiſtorians for their valour. After which example, ladies in France have affected the martial character, and diſtinguiſhed themſelves in the field. The transformation of monarchical Frenchmen into Republicans, is attended by another as monſtrous a transformation of women into men; and we know not which we are moſt to wonder at. Inſtead of raiſing themſelves to honour, both have forgotten their nature, and are equally out of place. A hen is a reſpectable animal when ſhe is feeding or brooding her chickens; but in a cockpit ſhe is ridiculous.

The doctrine of *equality* was introduced as a fine principle, when the Romans had changed their government: and their great men, who were too proud to ſubmit to kings, humbled themſelves in the moſt abject terms to the populace; in which they have been followed and exceeded by the new republicans of France; who, as ſoon as they had taken away the head, gave ſovereignty to the members, and ſet the feet uppermoſt. In

theſe particulars, we ſee, the French have followed the Romans; but in others they have differed from them to their ſhame. The Romans were wiſe enough to know, that they could never be well united, but under the obligations of religion: on which conſideration the forms and doctrines, eſtabliſhed under the ſecond of their kings, were retained inviolate through all the following ages. They began with the eſtabliſhment of piety: but our modern republicans began with the abolition of it. The Romans depended religiouſly, on ſuch Gods as they knew, for the protection of their ſtate, and ſerved them with ſupplications and thankſgivings; but the French, from all that appears, are of opinion they can better protect themſelves, and ſeem to have no Deity left but their Goddeſs of *Liberty*, with her altars. No heathens ever invaded the property of their prieſts, or ſeized lands, tenths, or offerings of any kind ſet apart for the maintenance of divine worſhip: but it was one of the firſt ſteps of the new government in France to ſeize all ſacred property whatſoever, and reduce their miniſters to miſerable ſtipendaries; dependents upon *them* inſtead

ſtead of dependents upon *God*. When the nation of Egypt was driven to the laſt extremity by a famine, the lands of the prieſts were ſpared, though all other lands were alienated. The Romans, when they carried wars about the world, honeſtly confeſſed their ambitious intention to make all other nations ſlaves, under a perſuaſion that Rome was to be the head of the world. The French on the contrary affect to carry *liberty* to other people—*ſpecie ſocios adjuvandi, re autem ſollicitante prædâ*—their errand is plauſible; but it appears in the iſſue that they are always well paid for it. The freebooters of England would gladly carry the ſame liberty to all the corporations and market-towns in this kingdom, if they might take their goods and money in exchange. In this all are agreed, that they who begin in robbery muſt go on with it, under ſome pretence or other: and true it is, all power muſt be maintained as it is acquired. If it deſcends by inheritance, it has nothing to do but to maintain the laws, for the laws will maintain it. But if it is acquired by violence, it muſt be ſupported by the ſame; and when any new authority ſtarts up which

the

the laws do not acknowledge, it muſt render itſelf reſpectable by ſanguinary terrors: and woe be to the people who are in ſuch a caſe!

Much has been ſaid, Sir, of late againſt the *expenſiveneſs* of our government; with deſign to perſuade unthinking people, that if the government were ruined, the nation would be ſaved. If I were ſpeaking to one of the common people upon this ſubject, I would deſire him to conſider, whether he has been taught to confound liberty of plunder with cheapneſs of living: a doctrine which has been offered as a temptation to many of the ſoldiery of this country; but, by the bleſſing of God upon their honeſty, very few of them have liſtened to it. When the idle may ſeize upon the gains of the induſtrious, to be ſure they live cheap for a time, though it ſeldom laſts long. I would alſo obſerve to them farther, that the very perſons who are moſt clamourous againſt our pecuniary diſtreſſes, are they whoſe politics brought upon us the enormous increaſe of our national debt: therefore by *them* this complaint is taken up as a convenience, in

the

the uſe of which they mean no more good to the nation at large than they did before. I would likewiſe remind them, that a projected equality would be of no general benefit for two reaſons: firſt, becauſe there never will be wealth to the end of the world where there is neither induſtry nor œconomy. Many of our murmurers are found amongſt thoſe, who can earn high wages for one half of the week, and ſpend the reſt at a public houſe, to the impoveriſhing of their wives and families: ſecondly, becauſe the poor of this country (excluſive of two millions and a half which they receive per annum in the poor rates) do better under the benevolence of the rich, than they would do if they were ſtewards for themſelves. It is the intereſt of the poor, that all gentlemen ſhould be rich where all gentlemen are charitable. On every occaſion of ſcarcity and diſtreſs, they take delight, and even vie with one another in relieving their poor neighbour. So diſtinguiſhed is the benevolence of this country above all others (and particularly *France*) that ſome are of opinion that our national character in this reſpect is delivered in the Revelation under the name of the church of Philadelphia;

Philadelphia; and the fate of that church, as there predicted, is agreeable to that promiſe of the Goſpel—*bleſſed are the merciful, for they ſhall obtain mercy.* Thus much I would ſay to the *poor*.

To the *rich* I ſay it is a low and ſordid policy, which makes *money* the meaſure of all things. There are ſome things for which we cannot give too much; and there are others too dear at any price. *Gin* is much cheaper than *Madeira:* and if it be a man's object to be drunk at as ſmall an expence as poſſible, gin will have the preference. Dr. *Adam Smith* ſeems to have reaſoned wholely on a ſuppoſition, that national wealth is national happineſs: With a Diſciple of *Voltaire*, as he was, who thought little or nothing about another life, this might paſs: but if a man brings *that* into the queſtion, we ſhall make a very different eſtimate of things; for money, which does every thing here, will do nothing there. The expenſiveneſs therefore of government is a topic, from which *Thomas Paine*, who addreſſed himſelf chiefly to thoſe who have little to expect in another life, conceived great

great hopes; and from which, our french-ified politicians have boldly predicted our ruin. But, to give it out among it's ſubjects, that a government muſt ſoon be ruined, is one ſly practice of the ſeditious to effect it's ruin: as, to bring on a revolution, it was trumpeted about in all our coffee-houſes by the emiſſaries of a wicked party, that there would certainly be a revolution in England: and we may give them the merit of partly believing what they ſaid, becauſe moſt of them know what *they* were doing to make a revolution. It was the ſame in France. Their buſy republicans ſpred abroad the belief of a revolution among the people; and I heard of it in England two years before it came to paſs, and of the baſe artifices then in practice to bring it about; which unhappily ſucceeded but too well on the ill-diſpoſed people they had to deal with. One way of killing a man is, to make him believe he is mortally ſick: under which perſuaſion, he will either be diſpirited into his death, or neglect the uſe of medicine. To you, Sir, who can compare cauſes and effects, and judge of things with calmneſs and proper diſcrimination, I ſhall confeſs, that

our taxes are very heavy, and the public income very great; but our taxes in England do not affect the loweſt ranks of the people, ſuch as day-labourers, like the taxes in *France*; and more than two thirds of the public income revert again to the nation, being applied to the payment of the intereſt, and the diſcharge of the capital, of the national debt, which has been contracting from the revolution to the end of the laſt war, in ſecuring the Britiſh dominions, and in defending ourſelves againſt a very powerful and ambitious neighbour. If during this period, wars have been waged without ſufficient occaſion, and the wealth of the public thereby improperly expended, every deſcription of men, who have directed the affairs of this country from the revolution to the end of the laſt war, ought to bear the blame: and it is ſingular, that the preſent adminiſtration have had no ſhare in augmenting the debt: they have the merit of having contrived a plan for the reduction of it, more likely to be ſucceſsful, than any hitherto deviſed; and which will certainly have the effect of conſiderably reducing the debt, and gradually diminiſhing the taxes, if the events

which

which are now impending, do not force us into a new war. The common annual expenditure of this country in time of peace, is by no means extraordinary, when we conſider the greatneſs of the country, the extent of our dominions in various parts of the world, and the almoſt univerſal commerce, to which ſome protection muſt always, even in time of peace, be extended. *

The expence of the civil government, though greater in appearance, is (if we conſider the comparative value of money) in effect leſs than in former periods. The ſalaries of many offices are in fact leſs than they were. Many antient offices have been aboliſhed; and I do not believe that the ſalary of any one office is become greater, if we take into conſideration the different value of money.

The cheapeſt governments certainly are deſpotic monarchies, ſuch as *Pruſſia*, where

* If the number of ſouls in Britain be taken, and compared with the whole of the revenue, how much will it amount to per *head?* It might be uſeful to ſhew this: becauſe people have been corrupted by an unfair ſtatement of this ſort reſpecting the impoſts in America.

little ſtate is kept up, and where the ſubject is obliged to ſerve the monarch for any allowance he may make him. The governments alſo of ſome republics are cheap; provided they are content to live within themſelves, and have little concern with other nations. Antient monarchies, in which from uſage great ſtate is maintained, and limited monarchies, in which ſome degree of ſtate, and ſome degree of influence is neceſſary for the purpoſe of making an impreſſion on the people, are, unavoidably in a certain degree, expenſive. It is ſingular, however, that the new republic in America, and the new republic in France, are forced to make the members of their legiſlatures a daily allowance; without which theſe republics would not find ſubjects, who would be at the trouble of giving their attendance for the purpoſe of making laws for them; which was the caſe in this country formerly, when we were much poorer than we are at preſent. In the buſineſs of life, there muſt be ſome motive to induce people to encounter the fatigues and dangers, to which public ſituations expoſe them: and if you wiſh to have a wiſe and honourable government,

theſe inducements muſt be in ſome degree equal to the talents of the men who are employed. I would only obſerve farther, that many of the hardeſt expences which happen under a government, are not ſuch as ariſe immediately from the government itſelf, but from the extortions and impoſitions of ſubjects on one another. Here it behoves every government to be as vigilant as it can, and to reſtrain ſo far as it's power goes, and to rectify abuſes before they become inveterate. The people are more commonly hurt by the weakneſs of government, in ſuffering infringements to be made upon it, than by a juſt and impartial execution of it's laws: on which conſideration, the people will find their advantage in the iſſue, if they unite like wiſe men and good ſubjects to ſtrengthen the hands of their own government; though the maxim be contrary to ſome of the current perſuaſions of Engliſhmen.

I have now, Sir, offered to you ſuch of my ideas on the ſubjects of the time, as are more fit for gentlemen than for the common people. You have a Son at the Univerſity, and two more, who are very forward in ſchool-

ſchool-learning. Pray put theſe papers into their hands, that they may know how to argue for the preſervation of their country. And give them notice to beware of thoſe raſcally Frenchmen, who attend in many of our ſchools and ſeminaries for the teaching of the french language, but are many of them ſpies and emiſſaries of republicans, who take the opportunity of recommending their pernicious politics to the young people with whom they are concerned. *Marat*, who makes ſuch a figure among the new tyrants of France, was, a teacher of the french language at Oxford; and in his character but a pattern of many more. When *Thomas Bull*'s firſt letter was ſhewn to one of theſe, who teaches in a very reſpectable ſeminary, he fell into a violent rage, and pronounced it all to be *Bêtiſe! Sottiſe! ſtupidity and nonſenſe*. And why ſo? Is it not becauſe they, who wiſh to ſee this country ruined, hate the principles on which we hope to ſee it ſaved. Another of theſe gentlemen, for the notoriety of his principles, was impriſoned by the boys of a great ſchool; and after he had cried out of the window for his liberty to the people in the ſtreet, they

they made him ſing, as well as he could, *God ſave the king*, before they releaſed him. All theſe, wherever they are to be found, ſhould now be well looked to: the times demand it: and maſters and tutors ſhould admit ſuch only as are known to be of good principle as well as good ability. Let the Gentry alſo be aware of their french ſervants: for many of them are ſpies.

We are alſo called upon to pay ſome regard to thoſe laws made in ſupport of religion; which the ſame Right Honourable Gentleman would aboliſh, who in his printed ſpeech (if it be genuine) objected *high treaſon* to the firſt innocent letter of *Thomas Bull* to his *Brother John*. When a piece is overcharged, it is apt to burſt in the hand; which actually happened, when the piece was levelled at *Thomas Bull*'s letter. Such accidents ſhould be avoided: and it might be a bleſſing to themſelves and their country, if certain gentlemen, of high parts, and great popularity, would read more, and talk leſs; that they may know better what is *true*, and ſpeak *for* it inſtead of ſpeaking *againſt* it. There is a wild audacious ſpirit ſtirring;

ſtirring; which, preſuming on a ſuppoſed fear in the government to do itſelf juſtice, mounts upon a table, to inflame the multitude with incendiary ſpeeches. Blaſphemous writings are publiſhed with the like audacity; not only breaking, but even menacing the laws, and reflecting upon thoſe who have neglected to put them in execution. Where can ſuch things end, but in the ruin of religion? The loſs of religion in *France* was the loſs of their government, and the chief cauſe of all their late enormities.

Our nation, Sir, is now in a ſtate of vigilance: but it muſt continue ſo. French anarchy was breaking in at the front door of the houſe. That door is now barred and guarded: but we are far from being ſure that another attempt will not be made upon it: and if not that, we are ſtill to take care that it does not enter by ſtealth at the *other* door of *reformation:* a good thing in good times, but a frightful thing at this time: becauſe no man can ſay, from it's firſt ſtep, what will be it's laſt. The *meeting of the Notables* in France, was the beginning: the bloody death of *Louis* their *well-beloved*, is the

the end! If it ſhould pleaſe God that any like calamities ſhould fall upon us; let all true men ſtand their ground: and I ſecond my advice with a ſtory. A worthy friend of *Thomas Bull* was obſerving to a French emigrant, the ſon of a nobleman, and of late an officer in the army, that in caſe of a revolution here, we ſhould not be able to fly, as they had done, to any place of refuge: ſo much the better, ſaid he; you will then be under the neceſſity of dying with your ſwords in your hands: and had we reſolved to do the ſame, we might have ſaved ourſelves and our country.

Believe me, Sir, with all proper Reſpect,

Your affectionate Relation,

and obedient humble Servant,

THOMAS BULL.

London, Jan. 30,
1793.